

espèce'. Under Article 10c the name *alfacariensis* Berger, 1945 (rather than 1948, as proposed by Dr Kudrna) is available, but probably not valid for reasons of priority. Five years later, having been advised (but on mistaken grounds; see BZN 45: 30, para. 7) by F. Hemming that *alfacariensis* Ribbe, 1905 was unavailable, Berger adopted *australis* Verity, 1911; unfortunately this name also suffers from the drawbacks discussed in the application and the comments above, and the subsequent confusion began.

It is high time that this situation, which is entirely a matter of nomenclatural niceties, is resolved. For reasons of both early date and usage it seems extremely desirable that either *alfacariensis* Ribbe, 1905 or *australis* Verity, 1911 should be adopted as the nomenclaturally valid name; any other choice (for example, *calida* Verity, 1916 or Verity & Querci, 1923; *alfacariensis* Bubaček, 1924 or Berger, 1945) would introduce fresh argument and instability.

The original application (BZN 45: 29–32) did not explicitly ask the Commission to set aside the Code's provisions in this case. This is necessary to fix the status of either *alfacariensis* Ribbe, 1905 or *australis* Verity, 1911, and I propose that the Commission should use its plenary powers to rule that one or the other of these two names is to be deemed available.

Additional reference

Reissinger, E.J. 1989. Checkliste Pieridae DUPONCHEL, 1835 (Lepidoptera) der Westpalaearkt (Europa, Nordwestafrika, Kaukasus, Kleinasien). *Atalanta*, 20: 149–185.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *heraclei* as the correct spelling for the specific name of *Musca heraclii* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Diptera) (Case 2719; see BZN 46: 252–254)

(1) F. Christian Thompson

Systematic Entomology Laboratory, U.S.D.A., Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

I oppose this application by White & Seymour. The application contains a number of errors:

- (a) The original spelling has been used by other authors in addition to Linnaeus (for example, Müller, 1776, p. 173).
- (b) *Musca heraclei* Fabricius, 1794 is not a subsequent use of *Musca heraclii* Linnaeus but a new and independent proposal for another species of fruit fly, now known as *Tephritis postica* (Loew, 1844).
- (c) While '*heraclei*' is the correct genitive of *Heracleum*, the plant genus, '*heraclii*' is also a correct genitive. *Harper's Latin Dictionary* (1888 edition) includes two alternative spellings of the same Latin words referring to either the city Heraclea (*Heraclea* or *Heracليا*) or to the personage Hercules (*Heracleus* or *Heraclius*). As there is no evidence of what Linnaeus based his name on, I would not question Linnaeus's Latin derivation.

- (d) If one does want to argue that Linnaeus incorrectly derived his name, then Loew's emendation (1844, p. 323) is valid.
- (e) The first use of the spelling *heraclei* for *Musca heracii* Linnaeus was by de Villers (1789, p. 507; see also Gmelin, 1790, p. 2858).

The difference in spelling between *heracii* and *heraclei* is minimal. Hence, the standardization on the correct original spelling (*heracii*) is unlikely to cause confusion. For economically important species which have common names, such as this species (celery fly), changes in scientific nomenclature cause virtually no confusion. For example, the cabbage root maggot, an important pest, was known for many years as *Anthomyia brassicae* Wiedemann (or Bouché). Pont (1981) showed that the proper specific name for the species was *radicum* Linnaeus. This radical change caused no confusion to at least the American community of economic entomologists as they use the common name exclusively. When needing to cite the scientific name, these entomologists merely use whatever is given in the most recent *Common Names of Insects and Related Organisms* list that is maintained by the Entomological Society of America. I believe the confusion caused by change in the spelling of *heracii* will be even less and, hence, the proposed change is unjustified.

Additional references

- Gmelin, J.F. 1790. *Caroli a Linné, Systema Naturae...* Ed. 13, vol. 1: *Regnum Animale*, pt. 5 (Insecta, pp. 2225–3020). Lipsiae.
- Loew, H. 1844. Kritische Untersuchung der europäischen Arten des genus *Trypeta* Meig. *Zeitschrift für Entomologie (Germar)*, 5: 312–437.
- Müller, O.F. 1776. *Zoologiae Danicae prodromus, seu Animalium Daniae et Norvegiae indigenarum characteres, nomina, et synonyma imprimis popularium*. xxxii + 274 pp. Havniae.
- Pont, A. 1981. The Linnaean species of the families Fanniidae, Anthomyiidae and Muscidae (Insecta, Diptera). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 15: 165–175.
- Villers, C.J. de. 1789. *Caroli Linnaei entomologia, faunae suecicae descriptionibus...*, vol. 3. ii + 657 pp., 4 pls. Lugduni.

(2) Ian M. White

CAB International Institute of Entomology, 56 Queen's Gate, London SW7 5JR, U.K.

I should like to reply to Thompson's above remarks.

- (a) Seymour and I did miss the fact that the spelling *heracii* had been used by a few 18th century authors; Thompson has been unable to find any 20th, or even 19th, century authors who used any spelling other than *heraclei*, and the purpose of this case is to reject that purely 18th century spelling of this pest of celery.
- (b) Fabricius (1794) does not make it clear that his *Musca heraclei* is a new species, although he does not mention Linnaeus. Fabricius redescribed other Linnaean species, and it is likely that he was doing so in this case and failed to mention Linnaeus; there is no proof either way. This doubt over what Fabricius was describing was noted in the application (BZN 46: 252, para. 2). The Fabricius collection was not consulted as this appears to be a peripheral issue to the established use of the non-Linnaean spelling. Thompson notes that the *heraclei* of Fabricius is now interpreted as *Tephritis postica* (Loew), a species associated with *Onopordon* (Asteraceae or Compositae). Fabricius named several tephritids